

Remarks

[0001] Herein, the "Action" or "Office Action" refers to the non-final Office Action dated April 15, 2008.

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims of the application. Claims 1-23 and 26-48 are presently pending. Claims 1, 11, 12, 18-23, 31, 33 and 43 are amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found at least at pages 6-26 and Figs. 1-9 of the Specification "as-filed." No claims are canceled herein. No new claims are added herein.

Substantive Claim Rejections

35 USC § 102 Claim Rejections

[0003] Claims 1-8, 10, 12-19, 21, 23, 26-30, 32-40 and 43-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,308,341 to Schofield et al. (hereinafter, "Schofield") (*Office Action*, p. 2).

[0004] Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance in light of the comments and amendments contained herein. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn and that the case be passed along to issuance.

[0005] **Claim 1** has been amended and now recites a method, comprising:

collecting, on a computer maintained within a vehicle, data from a plurality of systems of the vehicle, wherein the plurality of systems comprises:

a diagnostics system for providing one or more diagnostic codes; and at least one of a vehicle security system, an obstacle detection system, a vehicle media system, a vehicle environment system, or a vehicle sound system, wherein each vehicle system is connected to the computer by a respective interface;

generating, on the computer, an explanation of a vehicle condition based on at least one said vehicle diagnostics code comprising a set of symbols, wherein the explanation combines data collected from the diagnostic system with data collected from at least one other vehicle system;

generating a browsable network document which includes the data from the plurality of systems of the vehicle which has been collected and the explanation of the vehicle condition; and

transmitting the browsable network document from the vehicle to a remote client where vehicle system data and the explanation of the vehicle condition can be browsed.

[0006] In order for Schofield to anticipate this claim, Applicant submits that Schofield must disclose each and every element and feature of the claim and that they must be arranged in the same manner as the claim. Applicant respectfully submits that Schofield does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claim 1.

[0007] For example, Schofield does not show or disclose "generating a browsable network document which includes the data from the plurality

of systems of the vehicle which has been collected and the explanation of the vehicle condition" and then "transmitting the browsable network document from the vehicle to a remote client where vehicle system data and the explanation of the vehicle condition can be browsed", as recited in claim 1.

[0008] To support its assertion of anticipation of claim 1, the Office cites Schofield (*Office Action*, page 2; *Schofield*, col.21 ln.15 to col.22 ln.61). Schofield describes providing a video display within an vehicle, and then using the video display to show text and/or images of the owners manual or user manual for the vehicle and/or vehicle accessories (*Schofield*, col.21 lns.15-20). Schofield further describes that the display may supplement the users manual images or text information by presenting a video clip showing the user how to perform a desired task (*Schofield*, col.21 lns.30-41). For example, Schofield describes that when a user want to learn how to set the clock in the vehicle, the user may first read instructions from the users manual about how to set the clock, and may then view a video showing a person setting the clock (*Schofield*, col.21 lns.30-41). Schofield also describes that optionally, the display and selection of particular sections of the manual may be linked to activation of a vehicle warning or fault indication, such as a flat tire detection, or a detection of a burned out light bulb (*Schofield*, col.21 lns.45-50). When such occurs, the display may "display the appropriate portion of section of the manual (which may show instructions or video clips on how to correct or repair or replace the detected fault or item) or other appropriate

messages (such as an alert to take the vehicle in for service or repair)" (*Schofield*, col.21 lns.45-55).

[0009] However, Schofield does not show or disclose, "generating a browsable network document which includes the data from the plurality of systems of the vehicle which has been collected and the explanation of the vehicle condition" and then "transmitting the browsable network document from the vehicle to a remote client where vehicle system data and the explanation of the vehicle condition can be browsed", as recited in claim 1.

[0010] For the sake of thoroughness, Applicant notes that U.S. Patent No. 6,735,503 to Ames which has been cited by the Office with respect to 103 rejections of other claims does not describe the recited elements. The Office states that "Ames, discloses presenting the explanation at a remote client or transmitting the diagnostic code to the remote client" (*Office Action*, p.8; *Ames*, Abstract). Although Ames may disclose transmitting the diagnostic code to a remote client, Ames does not describe, "generating a browsable network document which includes the data from the plurality of systems of the vehicle which has been collected and the explanation of the vehicle condition" and then "transmitting the browsable network document from the vehicle to a remote client where vehicle system data and the explanation of the vehicle condition can be browsed", as recited in claim 1.

[0011] Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Schofield, and Applicant respectfully requests that the 102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0012] **Claims 2-8 and 10** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1. Additionally, claims 2-8 and 10 may be allowable over Schofield for independent reasons.

[0013] **Claim 12** recites a computer-readable medium having stored thereon a computer program having executable instructions for performing a process comprising:

collecting, on a computer maintained within a vehicle, data from a plurality of systems of the vehicle; wherein the plurality of systems comprises:

 a diagnostics system providing one or more vehicle diagnostic codes; and

 at least one of a vehicle security system, an obstacle detection system, a vehicle media system, a vehicle environment system, or a vehicle sound system; and

 generating an explanation of at least one said vehicle diagnostic code, wherein the explanation combines data collected from the diagnostics system with data collected from at least one other vehicle system to produce a severity ranking of the vehicle condition which is based at least in part on the data collected from the at least one other vehicle system.

[0014] In order for Schofield to anticipate this claim, Applicant submits that Schofield must disclose each and every element and feature of the claim and that they must be arranged in the same manner as the claim. Applicant respectfully submits that Schofield does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claim 12.

[0015] For example, Schofield does not show or disclose, “generating an explanation of at least one said vehicle diagnostic code, wherein the explanation combines data collected from the diagnostics system with data collected from at least one other vehicle system to produce a severity ranking of the vehicle condition which is based at least in part on the data collected from the at least one other vehicle system”, as recited in claim 12. For example, according Applicant's claim and as described in the Specification, an air conditioning error code may be automatically associated with a higher severity ranking when a vehicle is in Arizona than when the vehicle is in Michigan (*Specification*, p.19). Applicant submits that the claimed “severity ranking of the vehicle condition” is sufficiently definite and concrete and that it is not taught or suggested in the cited reference. While Applicant cites an example from the *Specification*, this is merely for helping the Office understand the definiteness of the claimed subject matter. In other words, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be “given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification” (*MPEP* §2111).

[0016] To support its assertion of anticipation of claim 12, the Office cites Schofield (*Office Action*, page 2; *Schofield*, col.21 ln.15 to col.22 ln.61). Schofield describes providing a video display within an vehicle, and then using the video display to show text and/or images of the owners manual or user manual for the vehicle and/or vehicle accessories (*Schofield*, col.21 lns.15-20). Schofield further describes that the display may supplement the user's manual images or text information by

presenting a video clip showing the user how to perform a desired task (*Schofield*, col.21 Ins.30-41). For example, Schofield describes that when a user want to learn how to set the clock in the vehicle, the user may first read instructions from the user's manual about how to set the clock, and may then view a video showing a person setting the clock (*Schofield*, col.21 Ins.30-41).

[0017] Schofield also describes that optionally, the display and selection of particular sections of the manual may be linked to activation of a vehicle warning or fault indication, such as flat tire detection, or a detection of a burned out light bulb (*Schofield*, col.21 Ins.45-50). When such occurs, the display may "display the appropriate portion of section of the manual (which may show instructions or video clips on how to correct or repair or replace the detected fault or item) or other appropriate messages (such as an alert to take the vehicle in for service or repair)" (*Schofield*, col.21 Ins.45-55).

[0018] However, Schofield does not show or disclose, "generating an explanation of at least one said vehicle diagnostic code, wherein the explanation combines data collected from the diagnostics system with data collected from at least one other vehicle system to produce a severity ranking of the vehicle condition which is based at least in part on the data collected from the at least one other vehicle system", as recited in claim 12. Instead, Schofield simply describes that in response to a vehicle fault indication (*e.g.*, flat tire detection), the display may "display the appropriate portion of section of the manual or other appropriate

messages (such as an alert to take the vehicle in for service or repair)" (*Schofield*, col.21 Ins.45-55). In contrast, according Applicant's claimed invention and as described in the Specification, a vehicle diagnostic code (*e.g.*, an air conditioning error code) may be combined with data collected from another vehicle system (*e.g.*, the GPS system) to produce a severity ranking of the vehicle condition (*e.g.*, a higher severity ranking for and error conditioning error code when a vehicle is in Arizona than when the vehicle is in Michigan) (*Specification*, p.19).

[0019] Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 12 is allowable over Schofield, and Applicant respectfully requests that the 102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0020] **Claims 13-22** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 12. Additionally, claims 13-22 may be allowable over Schofield for independent reasons. For example:

[0021] With regard to **Claim 20**, Applicant submits that Schofield does not show or disclose "generating a browsable network document which includes vehicle system data which has been collected and the explanation of the vehicle condition" and then "transmitting the browsable network document from the vehicle to a remote client where vehicle system data and the explanation of the vehicle condition can be browsed."

[0022] **Claim 23** has been amended and now recites a vehicle comprising:

- a vehicle diagnostic system;
- one or more other vehicle systems; and
- a host computer communicatively coupled to the vehicle diagnostic system and the one or more other systems via respective interfaces, wherein the computer is configured to:
 - collect data from a plurality of said vehicle systems;
 - generate a deciphered explanation of a vehicle diagnostic code, wherein the deciphered explanation contains a textual explanation of the vehicle diagnostic code and a graphical illustration of a component associated with the vehicle diagnostic code;
 - generate a browsable network document which includes the data from the plurality of said vehicle systems which has been collected and the deciphered explanation of the vehicle diagnostic code; and
 - transmit the browsable network document from the vehicle to a remote client.

[0023] In order for Schofield to anticipate this claim, Applicant submits that Schofield must disclose each and every element and feature of the claim and that they must be arranged in the same manner as the claim. Claim 23 is rejected under similar rationale as set forth in the rejection of claim 1 (*Office Action*, pp.2 and 4). Applicant respectfully submits that based on reasoning similar to that discussed above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Schofield does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claim 23. For example, Schofield does not show or disclose a host computer configured to, "generate a browsable network document which includes the data from the plurality of

said vehicle systems which has been collected and the deciphered explanation of the vehicle diagnostic code" and then "transmit the browsable network document from the vehicle to a remote client", as recited in claim 23. For the sake of brevity, Applicant has not repeated all of the arguments.

[0024] Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 23 is allowable over Schofield, and Applicant respectfully requests that the 102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0025] **Claims 26-30 and 32** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 23. Additionally, claims 26-30 and 32 may be allowable over Schofield for independent reasons.

[0026] **Claim 33** has been amended and now recites a vehicle-based system comprising:

 a diagnostics receiver module receiving a vehicle diagnostics code from a vehicle diagnostics system, the vehicle diagnostics code including a set of one or more symbols and corresponding to a vehicle condition;

 one or more interfaces corresponding to one or more other vehicle systems and configured to receive vehicle systems data from a respective vehicle system;

 means for generating an explanation of the vehicle condition based on the vehicle diagnostics code, wherein the explanation combines data received from the vehicle diagnostics system and at least one said other vehicle system, wherein the explanation contains a textual explanation of the vehicle condition and a graphical illustration of a component associated with the vehicle condition, and

 means for generating a browsable network document which includes the explanation of the vehicle condition based on the vehicle diagnostics code; and

 means for transmitting the browsable network document from the vehicle to a remote client.

[0027] In order for Schofield to anticipate this claim, Applicant submits that Schofield must disclose each and every element and feature of the claim and that they must be arranged in the same manner as the claim. Claim 33 is rejected under similar rational as set forth in the rejection of claim 1 (*Office Action*, pp.2 and 5). Applicant respectfully submits that based on reasoning similar to that discussed above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Schofield does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claim 33. For example, Schiofield does not show or disclose a vehicle-based system comprising "means for generating a browsable network document which includes the explanation

of the vehicle condition based on the vehicle diagnostics code; and means for transmitting the browsable network document from the vehicle to a remote client", as recited in claim 33. For the sake of brevity, Applicant has not repeated all of the arguments.

[0028] Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 33 is allowable over Schofield, and Applicant respectfully requests that the 102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0029] **Claims 34-40** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 33. Additionally, claims 34-40 may be allowable over Schofield for independent reasons.

[0030] **Claim 43** has been amended and now recites a method comprising:

receiving, on a vehicle based computer, a vehicle diagnostics code from a vehicle diagnostics system, the vehicle diagnostics code including a set of one or more symbols and corresponding to a vehicle condition;

receiving vehicle systems data from one or more of a vehicle security systems, an obstacle detection systems, a vehicle media systems, a vehicle environment systems, or a vehicle sound systems; and

retrieving an explanation of the vehicle condition based on the vehicle diagnostics code; wherein the explanation combines data from the vehicle diagnostics system and at least one said other vehicle system to produce a severity ranking of the vehicle condition which is based at least in part on the vehicle systems data received.

[0031] In order for Schofield to anticipate this claim, Applicant submits that Schofield must disclose each and every element and feature of the claim and that they must be arranged in the same manner as the claim. Claim 43 is rejected under similar rationale as set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 12 (*Office Action*, p.2). Applicant respectfully submits that based on reasoning similar to that discussed above in response to the rejection of claims 1 and 12, Schofield does not disclose all of the claimed elements and features of claim 43. For example, Schofield does not show or disclose a method comprising "retrieving an explanation of the vehicle condition based on the vehicle diagnostics code; wherein the explanation combines data from the vehicle diagnostics system and at least one said other vehicle system to produce a severity ranking of the vehicle condition which is based at least in part on the vehicle systems data received", as recited in claim 43. For the sake of brevity, Applicant has not repeated all of the arguments.

[0032] Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claim 43 is allowable over Schofield, and Applicant respectfully requests that the 102 rejection be withdrawn.

[0033] **Claims 44-48** are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 43. Additionally, claims 44-48 may be allowable over Schofield for independent reasons.

35 USC § 103 Claim Rejections

[0034] Claims 20, 22, 31, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Schofield in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,503 to Ames (hereinafter, "Ames") (*Office Action*, p.8).

[0035] Applicant respectfully traverses each of these 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance in light of the comments and amendments contained herein.

[0036] **Claims 20, 22, 31, 41 and 42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Schofield in view of Ames. Applicant notes that none of claims 20, 22, 31, 41 and 42 are independent claims, and that each of these claims ultimately depend from one of the independent claims (here claims 1, 12, 23 and 33 respectively). Applicant further notes that it is axiomatic that any dependent claims which depend from an allowable base claim are also allowable, and therefore the Applicant does not believe that it is necessary to present arguments in favor of claims 20, 22, 31, 41 and 42 as these claims should be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above in response to rejection of the independent claims, as well as for their own recited features which are neither shown nor supported by the cited references. Further, Ames fails to cure the deficiencies described above with respect to Schofield, and the §102 rejections of independent claims 1, 12, 23 and 33.

[0037] Accordingly, Applicant requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn and that claims 20, 22, 31, 41 and 42 be allowed in the next action.

Dependent Claims

[0038] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant submits that the Office withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0039] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Dated: 9/15/08

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 

Brian J. Pangre
Reg. No. 42,973
(509) 324-9256 x231
www.leeheyas.com